

I. REPLY TO REJECTIONS

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5-11, 14-25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 3,520,568 to White et al. (hereinafter "White"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

White discloses a clothes dryer 10 with a latch assembly having a strike 17 secured to a door member 13 and a cooperating resilient keeper 18 secured to a cabinet member 12 (see, for example, Figs. 1 and 2 of White). A resilient means 20 which is a substantially u-shaped leaf spring having concave portions that bow inwardly to form a restriction 25, and which cooperate with an enlarged blunt head portion 26 formed on the strike 17 to secure the door 13 (see, for example, Fig. 2 and col. 3, lines 10-17 of White). White fails to disclose or suggest a dryer comprising a pair of springs provided at a rear of the holders, respectively, as recited in independent claim 1.

As discussed during the personal interview, White only discloses a single u-shaped leaf spring. Further, there is no suggestion of a pair of springs.

Moreover, it would not have been an obvious design choice to modify the single u-shaped leaf spring of White to provide for two springs. For example, the spring action from the single u-shaped leaf spring 20 in White is obtained by the connected u-shaped portion. Dividing the single u-shaped leaf spring into various elements eliminates the spring action desired by having one unitary leaf spring. Thus, the proposed modification would render the leaf spring

unfit for its intended purpose. To restore the spring action of the divided leaf spring, significant modifications to the structure shown in White is required, as the resilient means 20 of White is fitted into a tight space 23.

Additionally, in White, the u-shaped curvature of the resilient means 20 of White appears unlikely to provide a strong vertical force component to hold the strike 17. Any force created by the curvature of the u-shaped resilient means 20 (i.e., leaf spring) will be divided into vertical and horizontal force components. The vertical force component of White will be weak because of the division of the force. In contrast, providing a spring to the rear of the holders allows the full force vector of the spring to press the holders because there is no division of the force components, and allow a tighter hold on the hook portion.

Consequently, it would not have been an obvious design choice to modify White to obtain a pair of springs, and White fails to render obvious all of the features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over the applied reference. Claims 2, 5-11, 14-25, and 27, which depend from independent claim 1, are likewise patentable over the applied reference for at least the reasons discussed above and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 6 of the Office Action, claims 1, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 3,261,628 to Kesling (hereinafter "Kesling"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kesling discloses a door latch having strike element 20 attached to the outer cabinet 12 and a catch assembly 36 attached to the door 16 (see, for example, Figs. 1-3 and col. 1, lines 60 through col. 2, line 20 of Kesling). The catch 36 further includes a spring clip element 52 having end portions 54 and 56 that are joined by a bent spring segment 58 that includes inwardly turned portions 60,62 that are spring biased towards each other by the bent spring segment 58 (see, for example, Fig. 3 and col. 2, lines 29-33 of Kesling). In Kesling, the spring force for the inwardly turned portion 60,62 comes from the u-shaped bent spring segment 58.

Similar to the discussion of White above, Kesling fails to disclose or suggest a pair of springs provided at a rear of the holders, respectively, as recited in independent claim 1. Firstly, there is no suggestion in Kesling of having a pair of springs. Secondly, it would not have been an obvious design choice to have a pair of springs. As with White, dividing the spring clip element 52 of Kesling at the bent spring segment 58 would eliminate the spring action. To restore the spring action of the spring clip element if divided would require significant modifications to the structure shown in Fig. 3 of Kesling.

Further, as with White, the vertical force component of Kesling appears weaker than the direct vertical force component that would be provided by a spring at a back of the holder. Consequently, independent claim 1 is patentable over Kesling. Claims 24 and 26, which depend from independent claim 1, are likewise patentable over the applied reference for at least the

reasons discussed above and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 7 of the Office Action, claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over White in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,674,295 to Padovani (hereinafter "Padovani"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Padovani fails to suggest or overcome the above discussed deficiencies in White. Consequently, claim 1 is patentable over the combination of White and Padovani. Claim 28, which depends from claim 1, is likewise patentable over the applied references and their combination on the basis of its dependence from claim 1, and for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection respectfully requested.

On page 8 of the Office Action, claims 29, 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over White in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,062,668 to Onderka et al. (hereinafter "Onderka"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Fig. 15 of Onderka fails to disclose or suggest a latch body. Instead, it discloses a detent adjustment device to facilitate the adjustment work during installation of the door of the appliance. The adjustment work allows the detent bolt 5 on the side of the door to penetrate only to a defined depth into the insulated housing 2 (see, for example, Figs. 15-17, col. 11, lines 31-39 of Onderka). The correct penetration depth of the detent bolt 5 occurs when the detent rollers 116 engage in the detent grooves 115 (see, for example, Figs. 15-17, col. 11, lines 51-53 of

Onderka). Further, it appears that the detent rollers 116 are rollers which appear to spin to allow the detent bolt 5 to enter and exit the calibration device smoothly but does not allow for strong holding of the detent bolt 5.

Consequently, none of White, Onderka, or their combination, render obvious the features of claim 29, and claim 29 is patentable over the applied references and their combination. Claims 30 and 32, which depend from claim 29, are likewise patentable over the applied references and their combination for at least the reasons discussed above and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Seth S. Kim, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. 10/720,394
Reply to Office Action of January 28, 2005

Docket No. K-0568

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carol L. Druzbeck, Esq.
Registration No. 40,287
Seth S. Kim, Esq.
Registration No. 54,577

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703-766-3701 DYK:CLD:SSK/knv
Date: APRIL 28, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610